

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/732,788	KONDO, MASAYUKI	
	Examiner Thu Khanh T. Nguyen	Art Unit 1722	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thu Khanh T. Nguyen. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. John J. Dresch. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 20 October 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 3 & 5

Identification of prior art discussed: all of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

*General discuss about the claimed invention and the prior art, in which the shape of the mold would not render the apparatus claims patentable over the prior art.*

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required